arXiv:1512.03024v1 [cs.LO] 9 Dec 2015

Representations of analytic functions and Weihrauch degrees

Arno Pauly
Computer Laboratory
University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
&
Département d'Informatique
Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium
Arno.Pauly@cl.cam.ac.uk

Florian Steinberg
Fachbereich Mathematik
TU-Darmstadt, Germany
steinberg@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

This paper considers several representations of the analytic functions on the unit disk and their mutual translations. All translations that are not already computable are shown to be Weihrauch equivalent to closed choice on the natural numbers. Subsequently some similar considerations are carried out for representations of polynomials. In this case in addition to closed choice the Weihrauch degree LPO^* shows up as the difficulty of finding the degree or the zeros.

1 Introduction

In order to make sense of computability questions in analysis, the spaces of objects involved have to be equipped with representations: A representation determines the kind of information that is provided (or has to be provided) when computing on these objects. When restricting from a more general to more restrictive setting, there are two options: Either to merely restrict the scope to the special objects and retain the representation, or to actually introduce a new representation containing more information.

As a first example of this, consider the closed subsets of $[0,1]^2$ and the closed convex subsets of $[0,1]^2$ (following [LRP15]). The former are represented by an enumeration of open balls exhausting their complement. The latter are represented as the intersection of a decreasing sequence of rational polygons. Thus, prima facie the notion of closed set which happens to be convex and convex closed set are different. In this case it turns out they are computably equivalent after all (the proof, however, uses the compactness of $[0,1]^2$).

This paper focuses on a different example of the same phenomenon: The difference between an analytic function and a continuous function that happens to be analytic. It is known that these actually are different notions. Sections 3.1 and 3.2 quantify how different they are using the framework of Weihrauch reducibility. As a further example Sections 3.3 and 3.4 consider continuous functions that happen to be polynomials versus analytic functions that happen to be polynomials versus polynomials. All translations turn out to be either computable, or Weihrauch equivalent to one of the two well-studied principles $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ and LPO^*. The results are summarized in Figure 3 on Page 11 and Figure 4 on Page 15.

The additional information one needs about an analytic function over a continuous function can be expressed by a single natural number – the same holds for the other examples studied. Thus, this can be considered as a instance of computation with discrete advice as introduced in [Zie12]. That finding this number is Weihrauch equivalent to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ essentially means that while the number can be chosen to be verifiable (i.e. wrong values can be detected eventually), this

is the only computationally relevant restriction on how complicated the relationship between object and associated number can be.

Before ending this introduction, we shall briefly mention two alternative perspectives on the phenomenon: Firstly, recall that in intuitionistic logic a negative translated statement behaves like a classical one, and that double negations generally do not cancel. In this setting the difference boils down to considering either analytic functions or continuous functions that are not not analytic. Secondly, from a topological perspective, Weihrauch equivalence of a translation to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ implies that the topologies induced by the representations differ. Indeed, the suitable topology on the space of analytic functions is not just the subspace topology inherited from the space of continuous functions but in fact obtained as a direct limit.

2 Background

This section provides a very brief introduction to the required concepts from computable analysis, Weihrauch reducibility, and then in more detailed introduction of the representations of analytic functions that are considered. For a more in depth introduction into computable analysis and further information, the reader is pointed to the standard textbook in computable analysis [Wei00], and to [Pau1X]. Also, [PER89] should be mentioned as an excellent source, even though the approach differs considerably from the one taken here. The research programme of Weihrauch reducibility was formulated in [Bra05], a more up-to-date introduction to Weihrauch reducibility can be found in the introduction of [BGH15].

2.1 Represented spaces

Recall that a **represented space** $\mathbf{X} = (X, \delta_{\mathbf{X}})$ is given by a set X and a partial surjection $\delta_{\mathbf{X}} :\subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to X$ from Baire space onto it. The elements of $\delta_{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}(x)$ should be understood as encodings of x and are called the **X-names** of x. Since Baire space inherits a topology, each represented space can be equipped with a topology: The final topology of the chosen representation. We usually refrain from mentioning the representation of a represented space in the same way as the topology of a topological space is usually not mentioned. For instance the set of natural numbers is regarded as a represented space with the representation $\delta_{\mathbb{N}}(p) := p(0)$. Therefore, from now on denote by $\mathbb{N}$ not only the set or the topological space, but the **represented space of natural numbers**. If the set that is to be represented already inherits a topology, we always choose the representation such that it fits the topology. This can be checked easily for the case $\mathbb{N}$ above, where the final topology of the representation is the discrete topology.

If $\mathbf{X}$ is a represented space and Y is a subset of $\mathbf{X}$, then Y can be turned into a represented space by considering the range restriction of the representation of $\mathbf{X}$ on it. We denote the represented space arising in this way by $\mathbf{X}|_Y$. Note that here only set inclusion is considered. The set Y may be a subset of many different represented spaces and the restrictions need not coincide. They often turn out to be inappropriate. We use the same notation $\mathbf{X}|_{\mathbf{Y}}$ if $\mathbf{Y}$ is a represented space already. In this case, however, no information about the representation of $\mathbf{Y}$ is carried over to $\mathbf{X}|_{\mathbf{Y}}$.

The remainder of this section introduces the represented spaces that are needed for the content of the paper.

Sets of natural numbers.

Let $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N})$ resp. $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N})$ denote the **represented spaces of open** resp. **closed subsets of** $\mathbb{N}$. The underlying set of both $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N})$ and $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N})$ is the power set of $\mathbb{N}$. The representation of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N})$ is defined by

$$\delta_{\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N})}(p) = O \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad O = \{p(n) - 1 \mid p(n) > 0\}.$$

That is: A name of an open set is an enumeration of that set, however, to include the empty set, the enumeration is allowed to not return a element of the set in each step. The closed sets $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N})$ are represented as complements of open sets:

$$\delta_{\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N})}(p) = A \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \delta_{\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N})}(p) = A^c.$$

Normed spaces, $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$, $\mathcal{C}(D)$.

Given a triple $\mathcal{M} = (M, d, (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}})$ such that (M, d) is a separable metric space and x_n is a dense sequence, $\mathcal{M}$ can be turned into a represented space by equipping it with the representation

$$\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(p) = x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} : d(x, x_{p(n)}) < 2^{-n}.$$

In this way $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbb{C}$ (where the dense sequences are standard enumerations of the rational elements) and $C([0, 1])$, $\mathcal{C}(D)$ (where D is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and the dense sequences are standard enumerations of the polynomials with rational coefficients) can be turned into represented spaces.

Sequences in a represented space.

For a represented space $\mathbf{X}$ there is a canonical way to turn the set of sequences in $\mathbf{X}$ into a **represented space $\mathbf{X}^{\mathbb{N}}$**: Let $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a standard paring function (i.e. bijective, recursive with recursive projections). Define a function $\langle\cdot\rangle : \left(\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}\right)^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ by

$$\langle(p_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\rangle(\langle m, n\rangle) := p_m(n).$$

For a represented space $\mathbf{X}$ define a representation of the set $X^{\mathbb{N}}$ of the sequences in the set X underlying $\mathbf{X}$ by

$$\delta_{\mathbf{X}^{\mathbb{N}}}(\langle(p_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\rangle) = (x_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N} : \delta_{\mathbf{X}}(p_m) = x_m.$$

In particular the spaces $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of real and complex sequences are considered represented spaces in this way. Also $\mathcal{C}(D)^{\mathbb{N}}$ briefly shows up in Section 3.2.

2.2 Weihrauch reducibility

Recall that a multivalued function f from X to Y (or $\mathbf{X}$ to $\mathbf{Y}$) is an assignment that assigns to each element x of its domain a set $f(x)$ of acceptable return values. Multivaluedness of a function is indicated by $f : \mathbf{X} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{Y}$. The domain of a multivalued function is the set of elements such that the image is not empty. Furthermore, recall that we write $f :\subseteq \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{Y}$ if the function f is allowed to be partial, that is if its domain can be a proper subset of $\mathbf{X}$.

Definition 1. *A partial function $F :\subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a **realizer** of a multivalued function $f :\subseteq \mathbf{X} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{Y}$ if $\delta_{\mathbf{Y}}(F(p)) \in f(\delta_{\mathbf{X}}(p))$ for all $p \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta_{\mathbf{X}})$ (compare Figure 1).*

A function between represented spaces is called computable if it has a computable realizer, where computability on Baire space is defined via oracle Turing machines (as in e.g. [Ko98]) or via Type-2 Turing machines (as in e.g. [Wei00]). The computable Weierstraß approximation theorem can be interpreted to state that an element of $\mathcal{C}([0,1])$ is computable if and only if it has a computable realizer as function on the represented space $\mathbb{R}$.

Figure 1: diagram



Every multivalued function $f :\subseteq \mathbf{X} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{Y}$ corresponds to a computational task. Namely: 'given information about x and the additional assumption $x \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$ find suitable information about some $y \in f(x)$'. What information about x resp. $f(x)$ is provided resp. asked for is reflected in the choice of the representations for $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$. The following example of this is very relevant for the content of this paper:

Definition 2. *Let **closed choice on the integers** be the multivalued function $C_{\mathbb{N}} :\subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N}) \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}$ defined on nonempty sets by*

$$y \in C_{\mathbb{N}}(A) \Leftrightarrow y \in A.$$

The corresponding task is 'given an enumeration of the complement of a set of natural numbers and provided that it is not empty, return an element of the set'. $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ does not permit a computable realizer: Whenever a machine decides that the name of the element of the set should begin with n, it has only read a finite beginning segment of the enumeration. The next value might as well be n.

From the point of view of multi-valued functions as computational tasks, it makes sense to compare their difficulty by comparing the corresponding multivalued functions. This paper uses Weihrauch reductions as a formalization of such a comparison. Weihrauch reductions define a rather fine pre-order on multivalued functions between represented spaces.

Definition 3. *Let f and g be partial, multivalued functions between represented spaces. Say that f is **Weihrauch reducible** to g, in symbols $f \leq_W g$, if there are computable functions $K :\subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $H :\subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that whenever G is a realizer of g, the function $F := (p \mapsto K(p, G(H(p))))$ is a realizer for f.*

H is called the **pre-processor** and K the **post-processor** of the Weihrauch reduction. This definition and the nomenclature is illustrated in Figure 2. The relation $\leq_{\mathrm{W}}$ is reflexive and transitive. We use $\equiv_{\mathrm{W}}$ to denote that reductions in both directions exist and $<_{\mathrm{W}}$ if this is not the case. The equivalence class of a multivalued function with respect to the equivalence relation $\equiv_{\mathrm{W}}$ is called the **Weihrauch degree** of the function. A Weihrauch degree is called non-computable if it contains no computable function.

Figure 2:



The Weihrauch degree corresponding to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ has received significant attention, e.g. in [BG11, BdBP12, Pau07, Myl92, Myl06, BGH15, Pau09]. In particular, as shown in [PdB14], a function between computable Polish spaces is Weihrauch reducible to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ if and only if it is piecewise computable or equivalently is effectively Δ^0_2-measurable.

For the purposes of this paper, the following representatives of this degree are also relevant:

Lemma 4 ([PDF15])**.** *The following are Weihrauch equivalent:*

- *$C_{\mathbb{N}}$, that is closed choice on the natural numbers.*

- $\max :\subseteq \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N}) \to \mathbb{N}$ *defined on the bounded sets in the obvious way.*
- $\mathrm{Bound} :\subseteq \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N}) \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}$*, where* $n \in \mathrm{Bound}(U)$ *iff* $\forall m \in U : n \geq m$*.*

In the latter chapters of this paper another non-computable Weihrauch degree is encountered: LPO*. Here, LPO is short for 'limited principle of omniscience'. We refrain from stating LPO* explicitly as it would need more machinery than we introduced. Instead we characterize it by specifying the representative that is used in the proofs:

Proposition 5. *The function* $\min : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}$ *defined on all of Baire space in the obvious way is a representative of the Weihrauch degree LPO***.*

LPO* is also called the Weihrauch degree of finitely many mind changes: To obtain the minimum of a function you may guess that it is the smallest value of the function up to now, and you will only be wrong a finite number of times.

To give a little more intuition as to why this Weihrauch degree shows up in this paper, note the following: LPO* is derived from the maybe simplest non-computable Weihrauch degree $\mathrm{LPO} : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}$ defined via

$$\mathrm{LPO}(p) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p \text{ is the zero function, i.e. } \forall n : p(n) = 0. \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In computable analysis LPO shows up as the Weihrauch degree of the equality test for real (or complex) numbers $\neq : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Now, LPO* corresponds to carrying out a fixed finite but arbitrary high number of equality tests on the real or complex numbers. It is known that $\mathrm{LPO} <_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{LPO}^* <_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$.

2.3 Representations of analytic functions

Recall that a function is analytic if it is locally given by a power series:

Definition 6. *Let* $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ *be a set. A function* $f : D \to \mathbb{C}$ *is called* ***analytic****, if for every* $x_0 \in D$ *there is a neighborhood* U *of* x_0 *and a sequence* $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *such that for each* $x \in U \cap D$

$$f(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} a_k x^k.$$

The set of analytic functions is denoted by $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$. Each analytic function is continuous, that is $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(D)$. If D is open, the analytic functions on D are smooth, i.e. infinitely often differentiable. An analytic function can be analytically extended to an open superset of its domain.

Recall that a **germ** of an analytic function is a point of its domain together with the series expansion around said point. As long as the domain is connected, an analytic function is uniquely determined by each of its germs. The one to one correspondence of germs and analytic functions only partially carries over to the computability and complexity realm: It is well known that an analytic function on the unit disk is computable if and only if the germ around any computable point of the domain is computable [Ko91]. However, the proofs of these statements are inherently non-uniform. The operations of obtaining a germ from a function and a function from a germ are discontinuous and therefore not computable [Mül95]. This paper classifies them to be Weihrauch equivalent to closed choice on the naturals in Theorems 12 and 14.

There is a more suitable representation for the analytic functions than the restriction of the representation of continuous functions. This representation has been investigated by different authors for instance in [KMRZ15],[KS05],[Mül95]. For simplicity we restrict to the case of analytic functions on the unit disk. Thus, let D denote the closed unit disk from now on. And let U_m denote the open ball $B_{r_m}(0)$ of radius $r_m := 2^{\frac{1}{m+1}}$ around zero. Recall from the introduction that the space $\mathcal{C}(D)$ of continuous functions is represented as a metric space (where $\mathbb{C}$ is identified with $\mathbb{R}^2$).

Definition 7. *Let $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$ denote the **represented space of analytic functions on** D, where the representation is defined as follows: A function $q \in \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N}$ is a name of an analytic function f on D, if and only if f extends analytically to the closure of $U_{q(0)}$, the extension is bounded by $q(0)$ and $n \mapsto q(n+1)$ is a name of $f \in \mathcal{C}(D)$.*

Note that the representation of $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$ arises from the restriction of the representation of continuous functions by adding discrete additional information. This information is quantified by the advice function $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega} :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(D) \to \mathbb{N}$ whose domain are the analytic functions and that on those is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega}(f) &:= \{q(0) \mid q \text{ is a } \mathcal{C}^\omega(D)\text{-name of } f\} \\ &= \{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid f \text{ has an analytic cont. to } U_m \text{ bounded by } m\}. \end{aligned} \tag{AC}$$

This function turns up in the results of this paper. In the terminology of [KMRZ15], one would say that $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$ arises from the restriction $\mathcal{C}(D)|_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}$ by enriching with the discrete advice $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega}$.

The topology induced by the representation of $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$ is well known and used in analysis: It can be constructed as a direct limit topology and makes $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$ a so called Silva-Space. For more information on this topology and its relation to computability and complexity theory also compare [KS05].

The set $\mathcal{O}$ of germs around zero, i.e. of power series with radius of convergence strictly larger than 1 can be made a represented space in a very similar way:

Definition 8. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ denote the represented space of germs around zero, where the representation is defined as follows: A function $q \in \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N}$ is a name of a power series $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, if and only if*

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N} : |a_k| \leq 2^{-\frac{k}{q(0)+1}} q(0)$$

and $n \mapsto q(n+1)$ is a name of the sequence $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ as element of $\mathbb{C}^\mathbb{N}$.

As above, this representation is related to the restriction of the representation of $\mathbb{C}^\mathbb{N}$ by means of the advice function $\mathrm{Adv}_\mathcal{O} :\subseteq \mathbb{C}^\mathbb{N} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}$ whose domain are the sequences with radius of convergence strictly larger than one and that is defined on those by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Adv}_\mathcal{O}((a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}) &:= \{q(0) \mid q \text{ is a } \mathcal{O}\text{-name of } (a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\} \\ &= \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \forall k \in \mathbb{N} : |a_k| \leq 2^{-\frac{k}{n+1}} \cdot n\} \end{aligned} \tag{AG}$$

Again, the topology induced by this representation is well known and used in analysis: It is the standard choice of a topology on the set of germs and can be introduced as a direct limit topology.

Proofs that the following holds can be found in [KMRZ15] or [Mül95]:

Theorem 9 (computability of summation)**.** *The assignment*

$$\mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{C}^\omega(D), \quad (a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mapsto \left(x \mapsto \sum_k a_k x^k\right)$$

is computable.

A proof of the following can be found in [KMRZ15]:

Theorem 10. *Differentiation is computable as mapping from $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$ to $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$.*

3 The results

For the sake of briefness of proofs, we open this chapter with an addition to Lemma 4. Given $p \in \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N}$ denote the support of this function by $\mathrm{supp}(p) := \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid p(n) > 0\}$. Furthermore, for a set A denote the number of elements of that set by $\#A$.

Lemma 11. *The function* $\mathrm{Count} :\subseteq \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$*, defined via*

$$\mathrm{dom}(\mathrm{Count}) = \{p \in \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N} \ \ \mathrm{supp}(p) \text{ is finite}\} \quad \mathrm{Count}(p) = \#\mathrm{supp}(p)$$

is Weihrauch equivalent to $C_\mathbb{N}$, that is: Closed choice on the naturals.

Proof. First construct a Weihrauch reduction that shows that $\mathrm{C}_\mathbb{N} \leq_\mathrm{W} \mathrm{Count}$: Let the pre-processor H be the function sending some $p \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathrm{C}_\mathbb{N})$ to the function that returns 1 on input n whenever its support up to n has less elements than the least element that has not been excluded from the set by the first n elements of the enumeration of the complement. This function is computable as can be seen from its recursive definition:

$$H(p)(n) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \min\{m \mid \forall j \leq n : p(j) - 1 \neq m\} > \#\{j < n \mid H(p)(j) = 1\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$H(p)$ has finite support, since the set described by p is nonempty: There is some m that will never show up as value of p and by definition the support of $H(p)$ will not outgrow that number. The function H is recursive. Applying a realizer of Count to $H(p)$ returns an encoding of the least element of the set encoded by p. Choose $K(p,q)(n) := q(0)$ to obtain a Weihrauch reduction.

For the opposite direction, i.e. $\mathrm{Count} \leq_\mathrm{W} \mathrm{C}_\mathbb{N}$ use Lemma 4 and replace $\mathrm{C}_\mathbb{N}$ by max. Define the pre-processor H of a Weihrauch reduction $\mathrm{Count} \leq_\mathrm{W} \max$ as follows:

$$H(p)(n) := \begin{cases} n+1 & \text{if } p(n) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This means that $H(p)$ is a $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N})$ name of $\mathrm{supp}(p)$. Applying max will give the maximal element of the support.

Define the post-processor K to be the function

$$K(p,q)(n) := \#\{m \mid m \leq q(0) \text{ and } p(m) > 0\}.$$

This function is computable and since $q(0)$ will always be the maximal element of the support of p, the composition counts the support of p and is a Weihrauch reduction. □

3.1 Summing power series

Section 2.3 mentioned that the operation of summing a power series is not computable on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Recall that $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}$ was the advice function of the representation $\mathcal{O}$ of germs around zero of analytic functions on the unit disk. The computational task corresponding to this multivalued function is to find from a sequence that is guaranteed to have radius of convergence bigger than one a constant witnessing the exponential decay of the absolute value of the coefficients (compare eq. (AG) on page 6). Theorem 9 states that summation is computable on $\mathcal{O}$. Therefore, the advice function $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}$ can not be computable. The following theorem classifies the difficulty of summing power series and $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}$ in the sense of Weihrauch reductions.

Theorem 12. *The following are Weihrauch-equivalent:*

- $\boldsymbol{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$*, that is: Closed choice on the naturals.*
- Sum*, that is: The partial mapping from* $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *to* $\mathcal{C}(D)$ *defined on the sequences with radius of convergence strictly larger than one by*

$$\mathrm{Sum}((a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}})(x) := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} a_k x^k.$$

  I.e. summing a power series.

- $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}$*, that is: The function from eq.* (AG) *on page 6. I.e. obtaining the constant from the series.*

Proof. Build a Weihrauch reduction circle:

$\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}}$ Sum: Lemma 11 permits to replace $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ by Count.

The Weihrauch reduction Count $\leq_{\mathrm{W}}$ Sum can be constructed as follows: Let the pre-processor be a realizer of the computable mapping that assigns to $p \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ the sequence $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$a_k := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p(k) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } p(k) = 0 \end{cases}.$$

Note that $p \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathrm{Count})$ means that p has a finite support, and the radius of convergence of $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is strictly bigger than one (it is infinite). Applying a realizer of Sum will result in a name of the corresponding function f. From the definition of $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ it is clear that $f(1) = \mathrm{Count}(p)$. Therefore, the post-processor can be chosen as the second projection composed with a realizer of the evaluation in 1, which is well known to be computable on the continuous functions.

Sum $\leq_{\mathbf{W}}$ $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}$: Let the pre-processor be the identity. Note that an element of $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}((a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$ and a $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$-name of $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ can easily be put together to an $\mathcal{O}$-name of $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. Thus the post-processor can be chosen to be the composition of this mapping and a realizer of the summation mapping on $\mathcal{O}$, which is computable by Theorem 9.

$\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}}$ $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$: Let the pre-processor be the function that maps a given name p of $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{C}^{\omega}$ to an $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N})$-name of the set $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}((a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$. Note that an enumeration of the complement of this set can be extracted from p as follows: For all k and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ dovetail the test $|a_k| > 2^{-\frac{k}{m+1}} m$. If it holds for some k, return m as an element of the complement. This

procedure indeed produces a list of the complement of $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}((a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$: If the above does not hold for any k, then $|a_k| \leq 2^{-\frac{k}{m+1}}m$ for all k and m is an element of $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}((a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$. Applying closed choice to this set will give result in a valid return value. Thus, choose the post-processor to be the second projection.

□

3.2 Differentiating analytic functions

Section 2.3 remarked that it is not possible to compute the germ of an analytic function just from a name as continuous function. The proof that this is in general impossible from [Mül95], however, argues about analytic functions on an interval. The first lemma of this chapter proves that for analytic functions on the unit disk it is possible to compute a germ if its base point is well inside of the domain. We only consider the case where the base point is zero, but the proof works whenever a lower bound on the distance of the base point to the boundary of the disk is known.

Lemma 13. Germ*, that is: The partial mapping from $\mathcal{C}(D)$ to $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ defined on analytic functions by mapping them to their series expansion around zero, is computable.*

Proof. Remember that the Cauchy integral formula, states that for an analytic function f

$$f^{(k)}(0) = \frac{k!}{2\pi i}\int_0^{2\pi} f\left(e^{it}\right) e^{-it(k+1)}dt.$$

It is well known that the integral is computable from a name of the function $f \in \mathcal{C}(D)$. This works uniformly in k. □

The next theorem is very similar to Theorem 12. Both the advice function $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega}$ and computing a germ around a boundary point are shown to be Weihrauch equivalent to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$. Note that the coefficients of the series expansion $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of an analytic function f around a point x_0 are related to the derivatives $f^{(k)}$ of the function via $k!a_k = f^{(k)}(x_0)$. Therefore, computing a series expansion around a point is equivalent to computing all the derivatives in that point.

Theorem 14. *The following are Weihrauch equivalent:*

- $\boldsymbol{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$*, that is closed choice on the naturals.*
- Diff*, that is the partial mapping from $\mathcal{C}(D)$ to $\mathbb{C}$ defined on analytic functions by*

  $$\mathrm{Diff}(f) := f'(1).$$

  I.e. evaluating the derivative of an analytic function in 1*.*
- $\mathrm{Adv}_{\boldsymbol{C}^\omega}$*, that is the function from eq.* (AC)*. I.e. obtaining the constant from the function.*

Proof. By building a circle of Weihrauch reductions:

$\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}}$ Diff: Use Lemma 11 and show Count $\leq_{\mathrm{W}}$ Diff instead.

Let p be an element of the domain of Count. That is: $\mathrm{supp}(p) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid p(n) > 0\}$ is finite.

Define a sequence of analytic functions $f_n : D \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$f_n(x) := (x - x_n)^{-2^{n+1}},$$

where $x_n := 1 + 2^{\frac{n+1}{2^{n+1}+1}}$



The sequence is carefully chosen such that

$$f_n'(1) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \forall x \in D : |f_n(x)| < 2^{-n}.$$

Furthermore, it is computable as a sequence of functions from $\mathcal{C}(D)$.

Consider the function

$$f(x) := \sum_{n \in \mathrm{supp}(p)} f_n(x).$$

Note that this function can be computed from p: To approximate f by a polynomial it suffices to approximate those f_n whose index is small. Let the pre-processor be a realizer of this assignment.

Note that applying Diff to the function f results in

$$\mathrm{Diff}(f) = f'(1) = \sum_{n \in \mathrm{supp}(p)} f_n'(1) = \#\mathrm{supp}(p).$$

Therefore, the post-processor $K(p, q) := q$ results in a Weihrauch reduction.

$\mathrm{Diff} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathrm{Adv}_{\mathbf{C}^\omega}$**:** Let the pre-processor be the identity.

An appropriate post-processor can be described as follows: Combine the return value of $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega}$ on the function f and the $\mathcal{C}(D)$-name of f to an $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$-name of f. Afterwards apply a realizer of the differentiation operator on $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$ which can be chosen computable by Theorem 10. Finally, obtain a $\mathcal{C}(D)$-name of f' from the $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$-name and evaluate it in 1.

$\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathbf{C}^\omega} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$**:** Theorem 12 proved that $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$. Therefore, show $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}$ instead.

Let the pre-processor be a realizer of the function Germ from Lemma 13, i.e., it maps a given name of $f \in \mathcal{C}(D)$ to a name of a germ $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of f in zero. Applying $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathcal{O}}$ will return a constant n for the sequence. Set $m := 4(n+1)^2$, then for $|x| \leq 2^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{2(n+1)}}$

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} a_k x^k\right| &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |a_k| \, 2^{\frac{k}{2(n+1)}} \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-\frac{k}{2(n+1)}} n \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - 2^{-\frac{1}{2(n+1)}}} n \leq 4(n+1)^2 = m.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{f}(x) := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} a_k x^k$$

defines an analytic extension of f to $B_{2^{\frac{1}{m+1}}}(0)$ which is bounded by m. Thus, the post-processor can be the second projection composed with a realizer of the function $n \mapsto 4(n+1)^2$.



Figure 3: The results of Theorems 9, 12 and 14 and Lemma 13.

□

Recall from the introduction that $\mathcal{C}(D)|_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}$ resp. $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}|_{\mathcal{O}}$ denote the represented spaces obtained by restricting the representation of $\mathcal{C}(D)$ resp. $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$, resp. $\mathcal{O}$. Theorems 9, 12 and 14 and Lemma 13 are illustrated in fig. 3.

3.3 Polynomials as finite sequences

Consider the set $\mathbb{C}[X]$ of polynomials with complex coefficients in one variable X. There are several straightforward ways to represent polynomials. The first one that comes to mind is to represent a polynomial by a finite list of complex numbers. One can either demand the length of the list to equal the degree of the polynomial or just to be big enough to contain all of the non-zero coefficients. Since the first option fails to make basic operations like addition of polynomials computable, we choose the second option.

Definition 15. *Let $\mathbb{C}[X]$ denote the **represented space of polynomials**, where the representation is defined as follows: $p \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a $\mathbb{C}[X]$-name of P if $p(0) \geq \deg(P)$ and $n \mapsto p(n+1)$ is a $\mathbb{C}^{p(0)}$-name of the first $p(0)$ coefficients of P.*

Let $\mathbb{C}_m[X]$ denote the set of monic polynomials over $\mathbb{C}$, i.e. the polynomials with leading coefficient equal to one. Make $\mathbb{C}_m[X]$ a represented space by restricting the representation of $\mathbb{C}[X]$. Monic polynomials are important because it is possible to compute their roots – albeit in an unordered way. To formalize this define a representation of the disjoint union $\mathbb{C}^\times := \coprod_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}^n$ as follows: A function p is a name of $x \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ if and only if $x \in \mathbb{C}^{p(0)}$ and $n \mapsto p(n+1)$ is a $\mathbb{C}^{p(0)}$ name of x. Note that the construction of the representation of $\mathbb{C}[X]$ is very similar. The only difference being that vectors with leading zeros are not identified with shorter vectors.

Now, the task of finding the zeros in an unordered way can be formalized by computing the multivalued function that maps a polynomial to the set of lists of its zeros, each appearing according to its multiplicities:

$$\mathrm{Zeros} : \mathbb{C}[X] \rightrightarrows \mathbb{C}^\times, \quad P \mapsto \left\{ (a_1, \ldots, a_{\deg(P)}) \mid \exists \lambda : P = \lambda \prod_{k=1}^{\deg(P)} (X - a_k) \right\}$$

The importance of $\mathbb{C}_m[X]$ is reflected in the following well know lemma:

Lemma 16. *Restricted to $\mathbb{C}_m[X]$ the mapping* Zeros *is computable.*

Proof sketch. This is well known. A nice description of an algorithm to do this can for instance be found in [LCL02], although algorithms were known a lot longer. We only sketch how to find out the degree, which is the number of zeros of the polynomial and therefore the first step towards computing the set of zeros as element of $\mathbb{C}^\times$. Get an approximation to each of the coefficients with precision $\frac{1}{2}$. Since the highest coefficient will be one, it can be found from this approximation. □

The main difficulty in computing the zeros of an arbitrary polynomial is to find its degree. A polynomial of known degree can be converted to a monic polynomial with the same zeros by scaling. On $\mathbb{C}[X]$ consider the following functions:

- deg: The function assigning to a polynomial its degree.
- Dbnd: The multivalued function where an integer is a valid return value if and only if it is an upper bound of the degree of the polynomial.

Dbnd is computable by definition of the representation of $\mathbb{C}[X]$. deg is not computable on the polynomials, however, from the proof of lemma 16 it follows:

Lemma 17. *The degree mapping is computable when restricted to the monic polynomials.*

The next result classifies finding the degree, turning a polynomial into a monic polynomial and finding the zeros to be Weihrauch equivalent to LPO*.

Proposition 18. *The following are Weihrauch-equivalent to LPO*:*

- deg*, that is the mapping from $\mathbb{C}[X]$ to $\mathbb{N}$ defined in the obvious way.*
- Monic*, that is the mapping from $\mathbb{C}[X]$ to $\mathbb{C}_m[X]$ defined on the non-zero polynomials by*

$$P = \sum_{k=0}^{\deg(P)} a_k X^k \mapsto \sum_{k=0}^{\deg(P)} \frac{a_k}{a_{\deg(P)}} X^k.$$

- Zeros $:\subseteq \mathbb{C}[X] \to \mathbb{C}^\times$*, mapping a non-zero polynomial to the set of its zeros, each appearing according to its multiplicity.*

Proof. Note that LPO* is Weihrauch equivalent to the function $\min : \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ by Proposition 5. Proceed by building a chain of Weihrauch equivalences:

$\min \equiv_\mathbf{W} \deg$**:** To show $\min \leq_\mathrm{W} \deg$ define the pre-processor as follows: $H(p)(0) := p(0)$. Therefore, $H(p)(n)$ should be an encoding of a dyadic approximation of a complex vector of length $p(0)$ to precision 2^{-n+1}. On input n define a dyadic vector as follows: Go through the values of p on numbers smaller than n. Whenever some $p(m)$ is smaller than all previously encountered values, fix the coefficient of $X^{p(0)-p(n)}$ to be non-zero in a way consistent with the previous approximations and set all higher coefficients to zero. If the degree of the resulting polynomial is d, then $\min p = p(0) - d$. Thus, choosing the post processor as $K(p, q) := p(0) - q(0)$ will lead to a Weihrauch reduction.

On the other hand to see $\deg \leq_\mathrm{W} \min$ let p be a $\mathbb{C}[X]$-name of a polynomial P. Set $H(p)(0) := p(0)$ and let $H(p)(n)$ be the minimal number such that the 2^{-n+1}-approximation of the polynomial is consistent with $\deg(P) = p(0) - m$. Apply min to this function to get $p(0) - \deg(P)$. Thus, the post-processor K can be chosen as $K(p, q) = p(0) - q(0)$

$\deg \equiv_{\mathbf{W}} \mathrm{Monic}$**:** For $\deg \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Monic}$ let the pre-processor be the identity. Applying Monic to the input will result in a monic polynomial of the same degree. Let the post-processor be the second projection composed with a realizer of the degree mapping on the monic polynomials that can be chosen computable by Lemma 17.

Monic $\leq_{\mathrm{W}} \deg$ is obvious since division by a non-zero number is computable.

$\mathrm{Monic} \equiv_{\mathbf{W}} \mathrm{Zeros}$**:** To see that Monic $\leq_{\mathrm{W}}$ Zeros note, that from approximations to a vector $(y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ of all the zeros of a polynomial P approximations to the coefficients of $\mathrm{Monic}(P)$ can be computed via

$$\mathrm{Monic}(P) = \prod_{k \leq n} (X - y_k).$$

For the opposite direction note, that P and $\mathrm{Monic}(P)$ have the same set of zeros and that the set of zeros can be computed from $\mathrm{Monic}(P)$ by Lemma 16.

□

3.4 Polynomials as functions

As polynomials induce analytic functions on the unit disk, the representations of $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$ and $\mathcal{C}(D)$ can be restricted to the polynomials. The represented spaces that result from this are $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)|_{\mathbb{C}[X]}$, resp. $\mathcal{C}(D)|_{\mathbb{C}[X]}$. Here, the choice of the unit disk D as domain seems arbitrary: A polynomial defines a continuous resp. analytic function on the whole space. The following proposition can easily be checked to hold whenever the domain contains an open neighborhood of zero and, since translations are computable with respect to all the representations we consider, if it contains any open set.

Denote the versions of the degree resp. degree bound functions that take continuous resp. analytic functions by $\deg_{\mathcal{C}(D)}$, $\mathrm{Dbnd}_{\mathcal{C}(D)}$ resp. $\deg_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}$, $\mathrm{Dbnd}_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}$. When polynomials are regarded as functions, resp. analytic functions, these maps become harder to compute.

Theorem 19. *The following are Weihrauch-equivalent:*

- $C_{\mathbb{N}}$*, that is: Closed choice on the naturals.*
- $\mathrm{Dbnd}_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}$*, that is: Given an analytic function which is a polynomial, find an upper bound of its degree.*
- $\deg_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}$*, that is: Given an analytic function which is a polynomial, find its degree.*

Proof. Build a circle of Weihrauch reductions:

$\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathrm{Dbnd}_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}$**:** Use Lemma 4 and reduce to Bound instead. Thus, let p be an enumeration of some bounded subset of the natural numbers. Define a polynomial P as follows:

$$P(X) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-\max\{n, p(n)\}} X^{p(n)}.$$

One readily verifies that a $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$-name of the function f corresponding to P can be computed from p: A $\mathcal{C}(D)$-name of f is easy to get hold of as the coefficients fall fast enough with n, and it is easy to check that 1 is an allowed value of $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega}(f)$. Let the pre-processor H be a realizer of this assignment.

Obviously $\mathrm{Dbnd}_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}(f)$ is an upper bound of the set enumerated by p. This means that the choice $K(p, q) := q$ for the post-processor results in a Weihrauch reduction.

$\mathrm{Dbnd}_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \deg_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}$**:** Is trivial: Using the identity as pre-processor and the second projection as post-processor will do.

$\deg_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$**:** By Lemma 4 replace $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ with max. Let p be a $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$-name of the function corresponding to some polynomial P. Shifting the name will result in a $\mathcal{C}(D)$-name of P and by Lemma 13 a $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$-name q of the series of coefficients of P can be computed from this. Let d_n denote the enumeration of the rational elements of $\mathbb{C}$ that was fixed for the definition of the representation of $\mathbb{C}$. Define the pre-processor H as follows:

$$H(p)(\langle m,n\rangle) := \begin{cases} n+1 & \text{if } \left|d_{q(\langle m,n\rangle)}\right| > 2^{-m} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This pre-processor is computable and $H(p)$ enumerates the set of indices k such that a_k is not zero. Therefore, applying max will result in the degree of the polynomial and $K(p,q) := q$ can be chosen as post-processor of a Weihrauch reduction.

□

From the proof of the previous theorem it can be seen, that stepping down from analytic to continuous functions is not an issue. For sake of completeness we add a slight tightening of the third item of Theorem 14 and state this as theorem:

Theorem 20. *The following are Weihrauch-equivalent to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$:*

- $\deg_{\mathcal{C}(D)}$*, that is: Given a continuous function which is a polynomial, find its degree.*
- $\mathrm{Dbnd}_{\mathcal{C}(D)}$*, that is: Given an analytic function which is a polynomial, find an upper bound of its degree.*
- $\mathrm{Adv}_{C^\omega}|_{\mathbb{C}[X]}$*, that is: Given a continuous function which happens to be a polynomial, find the constant needed to represent it as analytic function.*

Proof. Weihrauch equivalence of the first two bullets to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ directly from the proofs of Theorem 19. For the last item first note, that the Weihrauch reduction $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ constructed in Theorem 14 is also a Weihrauch reduction showing $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega}|_{\mathbb{C}[X]} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$. This is generally true for restrictions. On the other hand, the sequence f_n of analytic functions in the proof of the reduction $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega}$ in the same theorem may be replaced by rational polynomials that approximate the functions and their derivative well enough. This way, the constructed function f is a polynomial and the reduction a Weihrauch reduction to the restriction $\mathrm{Adv}_{\mathrm{C}^\omega}|_{\mathbb{C}[X]}$. □

$\mathrm{Dbnd}_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}$ may be regarded as the advice function of $\mathbb{C}[X]$ over $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$: The representation where a function p is a name of a polynomial P if and only if $p(0) = \mathrm{Dbnd}_{\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)}$ and $n \mapsto p(n+1)$ is a $\mathcal{C}^\omega(D)$-name of P is computationally equivalent to the representation of $\mathbb{C}[X]$. The same way, $\mathrm{Dbnd}_{\mathcal{C}(D)}$ can be considered an advice function of $\mathbb{C}[X]$ over $\mathcal{C}(D)$.

Figure 4 illustrates Lemma 16, Proposition 5 and Theorems 19 and 20.

4 Conclusion

Many of the results proved in Section 3 work for more general domains: Lemma 13 generalizes to any computable point of the interior of an arbitrary domain. It can be made a uniform statement



Figure 4: The result of Lemma 16, Proposition 5 and Theorems 19 and 20.

by including the base point of a germ. In this case for the proof to go through computability of the distance function of the complement of the domain of the analytic function is needed.

Another example is the part of Theorem 14 that says finding a germ on the boundary is difficult. In this case a disc of finite radius touching the boundary in a computable point is needed. Alternatively, a simply connected bounded Lipshitz domain with a computable point in the boundary can be used. Also in this case it seems reasonable to assume that a uniform statement can be proven.

Furthermore, after considering polynomials and analytic functions [KS05] also investigates representations for the set of distributions with compact support. In the same vain as in this paper one could compare these representation and the representation of distributions as functions on the spaces of test functions.

References

[BdBP12] Vasco Brattka, Matthew de Brecht, and Arno Pauly. Closed choice and a uniform low basis theorem. Ann. Pure Appl. Logic, 163(8):986–1008, 2012.

[BG11] Vasco Brattka and Guido Gherardi. Effective choice and boundedness principles in computable analysis. Bull. Symbolic Logic, 17(1):73–117, 2011.

[BGH15] Vasco Brattka, Guido Gherardi, and Rupert Hölzl. Probabilistic computability and choice. Inform. and Comput., 242:249–286, 2015.

[Bra05] Vasco Brattka. Effective Borel measurability and reducibility of functions. MLQ Math. Log. Q., 51(1):19–44, 2005.

[KMRZ15] Akitoshi Kawamura, Norbert Müller, Carsten Rösnick, and Martin Ziegler. Computational benefit of smoothness: Parameterized bit-complexity of numerical operators on analytic functions and Gevrey's hierarchy. J. Complexity, 31(5):689–714, 2015.

[Ko91] Ker-I Ko. Complexity theory of real functions. Progress in Theoretical Computer Science. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1991.

[Ko98] Ker-I Ko. Polynomial-time computability in analysis. In Handbook of recursive mathematics, Vol. 2, volume 139 of Stud. Logic Found. Math., pages 1271–1317. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998.

[KS05] Daren Kunkle and Matthias Schröder. Some examples of non-metrizable spaces allowing a simple type-2 complexity theory. In Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Computability and Complexity in Analysis (CCA 2004), volume 120 of Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci., pages 111–123. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2005.

[LCL02] David Lester, Scott Chambers, and Heoi Lee Lu. A constructive algorithm for finding the exact roots of polynomials with computable real coefficients. Theoret. Comput. Sci., 279(1-2):51–64, 2002.

[LRP15] Stéphane Le Roux and Arno Pauly. Finite choice, convex choice and finding roots. Logical Methods in Computer Science, 11(4), 2015.

[Mül95] Norbert Th. Müller. Constructive aspects of analytic functions. In Ker-I Ko and Klaus Weihrauch, editors, Computability and Complexity in Analysis, volume 190 of Informatik Berichte, pages 105–114. FernUniversität Hagen, September 1995. CCA Workshop, Hagen, August 19–20, 1995.

[Myl92] Uwe Mylatz. Vergleich unstetiger Funktionen in der Analysis. Diplomarbeit, Fachbereich Informatik, FernUniversität Hagen, 1992.

[Myl06] Uwe Mylatz. Vergleich unstetiger Funktionen : "Principle of Omniscience" und Vollständigkeit in der C-Hierarchie. PhD thesis, Fernuniversität, Gesamthochschule in Hagen, Mai 2006.

[Pau07] Arno Pauly. Methoden zum Vergleich der Unstetigkeit von Funktionen. Masters thesis, FernUniversität Hagen, 2007.

[Pau09] Arno Pauly. Infinite oracle queries in type-2 machines (extended abstract). arXiv:0907.3230v1, July 2009.

[Pau1X] Arno Pauly. On the topological aspects of the theory of represented spaces. Computability, 201X. accepted for publication, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.3763.

[PdB14] Arno Pauly and Matthew de Brecht. Non-deterministic computation and the Jayne Rogers theorem. Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science, 143, 2014. DCM 2012.

[PDF15] Arno Pauly, George Davie, and Willem Fouché. Weihrauch-completeness for layerwise computability. arXiv:1505.02091, 2015.

[PER89] Marian B. Pour-El and J. Ian Richards. Computability in analysis and physics. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[Wei00] Klaus Weihrauch. Computable analysis. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000. An introduction.

[Zie12] Martin Ziegler. Real computation with least discrete advice: a complexity theory of nonuniform computability with applications to effective linear algebra. Ann. Pure Appl. Logic, 163(8):1108–1139, 2012.

Acknowledgements.

The work has benefited from the Marie Curie International Research Staff Exchange Scheme Computable Analysis, PIRSES-GA-2011- 294962. The first author was supported partially by the ERC inVEST (279499) project.